Redacted Copy

Page 997

Before the

Federal Communications Commission Washington, D.C. 20554

DOOKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Wednesday,
April 27, 2011
Volume 4

Hearing Room TW-A363 445 12th Street, S.W. Washington, D.C.

The above-entitled matter came on for hearing, pursuant to notice, at 9:30 a.m.

BEFORE:

THE HONORABLE JUDGE RICHARD L. SIPPEL

Chief Administrative Law Judge

APPEARANCES

On Behalf of Comcast Cable Communications, LLC

MICHAEL P. CARROLL, ESQ ANDREW N. DeLANEY, ESQ EDWARD N. MOSS, ESQ DAVID B. TOSCANO, ESQ

of: Davis Polk & Wardwell, LLP 450 Lexington Avenue New York, New York 10017 (212) 450-4000

DAVID H. SOLOMON, ESQ J. WADE LINDSAY, ESQ

of: Wilkinson, Barker and Knauer, LLP 2300 N Street, N.W. Suite 700 Washington, D.C. 20037 (202) 783-4141

On Behalf of The Tennis Channel, Inc.

C. WILLIAM PHILLIPS, ESQ PAUL SCHMIDT, ESQ NEEME TRIVEDI, ESQ

of: Covington & Burling, LLP
The New York Times Building
620 Eighth Avenue
New York, New York 10018-1405

(212) 841-1081

of:

LEAH E. POGORILER, ESQ ROBERT SHERMAN, ESQ STEPHEN A. WEISWASSER, ESQ Covington & Burling, LLP 1201 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20004-2401 (202) 662-5115

On Behalf of the Federal Communications
Commission

WILLIAM H. KNOWLES-KELLETT, ESQ
GARY OSHINSKY, ESQ

Investigations and Hearings Division

Enforcement Bureau

Federal Communications Commission

1270 Fairfield Road

Gettysburg, Pennsylvania 17325

(717) 338-2505

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	
WITNESS DIRECT CROSS REDIRECT R	ECROSS
Hal Singer	
Mr. Phillips 1165/1198	
Mr. Carroll 1021	1182
Mr. Orshinsky 1193	
Mr. Knowles-Kellett	1105
Jonathan Orszag	
Mr. Toscano 1201	
Mr. Schmidt 1254	
Mr. Knowles-Kellett 1450	
EXHIBIT	MARK RECD
Tennis Channel	
209 Tennis Channel Board	1002
308 10-K	1165
306 Distribution Status Report	1341 1341
Comcast	
1010 Dictionary of Economics	1023
1055 List of DMAs	1027
1057	1104
1020 Testimony in MASN Case	1121
1009 FCC Decision	1129
1047 Dish Case Decision	1183
80 Orszag Testimony	1203 1204
1103 Table 1A	1213 1215
1102 Table 1B	1217 1218
1101 Programming Expenditures	1226 1227
1100 Rebuttal Opinion	1238 1240
1008 Sampling of Markets	1243

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

9:36 a.m.

JUDGE SIPPEL: The door is open.

Is there going to be a need to be concerned about closing the courtroom with in camera?

MR. CARROLL: Yes, Your Honor. I have kind of one very important thing, and I noted this -- I just wanted to get this out on the table right away.

JUDGE SIPPEL: I haven't reported on the baseball game yet.

MR. CARROLL: What was the score?

JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, I hadn't got
to that yet. It was 6 to 4, the Nats, that
being the Nationals. They got three home
runs. They still haven't learned that you've
got to put somebody on the base before you hit
the home run.

(Laughter.)

But the Mets were a fine, young, scrappy team, and I feel very good about it.

Because I said, I told my daughter, I said,

	Page 1003
1	JUDGE SIPPEL: By the way, we
2	received your motion to strike and appreciate
3	that.
4	MR. PHILLIPS: I have hard copies
5	of that, if Your Honor would like.
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: I would, but we
7	have received it, and we're much aware of it.
8	MR. PHILLIPS: Well, I have hard
9	copies of it, Your Honor. I just have to find
10	them. We also we served it last night.
11	JUDGE SIPPEL: Thank you. Thank
12	you.
13	MR. PHILLIPS: You're welcome.
14	MR. SCHMIDT: Your Honor, there is
15	one other housekeeping matter we wanted to
16	raise at Your Honor's convenience.
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes?
18	MR. SCHMIDT: Last night, about
19	9:30, we received what is represented to us as
20	another opinion from Mr. Orszag. It came
21	along with a lot of data underlying it, so
22	much data that it had to be sent in five

different emails to get through.

Apparently, as best we can figure out, it's not actually the complete data set, but basically, we're now in a position where the night before his testimony, he's provided us with a new substantiative report.

We called Dr. Singer to say, we're sending this data to you. We were very mindful of Your Honor's admonition. We said, we don't want to talk about your testimony, we just want you to have this data.

JUDGE SIPPEL: That was perfectly appropriate.

MR. SCHMIDT: Yes, as I understand it, Dr. Singer said, I can't figure this out.

I think his assistant looked at it overnight and now says we're missing some of the data needed to actually run Mr. Orszag's data.

So we find ourselves in this position where Mr. Orszag is set to testify today, and we can't figure out what his opinions on this subject are other than it's

very clear he disagrees with Dr. Singer.

I think it relates to the last line of questioning Mr. Carroll was covering last night, and we have no way of effectively cross examining him on it, because we can't figure out the data, and we literally got it the night before.

And as I understand it, when someone -- one of Dr. Singer's colleagues looked at it, he couldn't figure out how to make it run, and that's the limits of my technical knowledge on this. This is what I've been told about the data.

I think we're in a position where we have to wait to see how it comes in, but we find ourselves in a position where we're surprised by new information coming in on the eve of testimony after we've presented Dr. Singer for his direct, so he can't respond in his direct. He can't respond in his redirect, because we can't figure out what Mr. Orszag did.

wanted to let Your Honor know about this. If it does end up coming in, we could find ourselves in a position where we ask to recall Mr. Orszag for further testimony on this, if he's allowed to give an opinion on this, so we can effectively cross examine him on this, and/or where we have to do a rebuttal report from Dr. Singer once we're able to figure out what this analysis is and how it works.

I just wanted to bring that to the court's attention. I think it will ripen at some point today, at least in terms of whatever opinion Mr. Orszag has to offer on this issue being presented to the court.

JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, that's a rather significant development.

Can you shed some light on that,
Mr. Carroll?

MR. CARROLL: Absolutely, Your

Honor. And good morning again.

JUDGE SIPPEL: Good morning.

MR. CARROLL: I wish Counsel had told us this. This is the first time hearing of these issues. I've been here all morning with Mr. Schmidt. He could have called me last night.

2.0

What happened is, Mr. Singer himself came in with a new opinion -
JUDGE SIPPEL: Dr. Singer.

MR. CARROLL: Dr. Singer came in with a new opinion last week, and we didn't complain. We had trouble accessing the database as well.

We let our friends know, and it wasn't until Friday that we actually get -- of last week, got an answer to where the database had come from.

The answer was actually wrong, but we struggled our way through over the weekend, and the subject that I was examining on at the end of the day yesterday is that subject. It relates to the material that was that new to us.

We have an expert who now is in the same area, and he's going to rebut what Dr. Singer has offered, what Dr. Singer offered late to us, we're dealing with it, and it's only in rebuttal to what Dr. Singer's doing.

I think --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, it was only in rebuttal, or to address those items that you just said were delivered to you late, were late coming?

MR. CARROLL: Exactly right.

JUDGE SIPPEL: Nothing else.

MR. CARROLL: You follow me,

there's nothing else. It's purely rebuttal to

16 the new opinion that Dr. Singer came in with

for the first time, which was so new we

couldn't even depose him about it. He came in

19 with it after the deposition.

Now, again, I didn't raise any of

21 these issues to complain. I figured we'll

just work our way through it.

I think that it's an area where -well, economists will get very focused on it.

I'm not sure the extent to which the court
will find it dispositive or not, but I'm all
for getting all the facts out so that you can
have a full record in this area.

And therefore, if there truly is any difficulty my friends on the other side are having in digesting the information or, you know, figuring something out with it, I have no objection in advance to if they want to put in another rebuttal report afterwards. I know Your Honor has sometimes done that in other proceedings. I think in one of the MASN cases you did that.

Nobody's trying to hamstring them or cut them off. But we have to be able to respond in kind to a new opinion that we received from Dr. Singer, unless that's going to be struck from the record.

And that's the nature of what this is. We gave them the information. We were

running it all weekend. I think they knew we were running it all weekend because we told them on Friday we were still having trouble opening their database, and we couldn't get the numbers to match.

And so I doubt there's any surprise about the fact, truthfully, that we were working on something in this area, and we finally sorted our way through it over the weekend. We gave them the information as soon as we were able to do it.

The volume of the database, all of the data is basically the same data. We have two economists who are running regression analysis on common information about market shares, and they're just different ways of cutting the database is all it is, so there's no new, hardcore data that's in this.

It's just an expert rebutting another expert's presentation on how that data should be handled.

JUDGE SIPPEL: Now, let me just

ask the question, Mr. Schmidt. Is it true?

I mean, do you agree with that, that it's

basically, it's the same data, it's just that

it's been rearranged in some different form?

Go ahead.

MR. SCHMIDT: I think that's broadly true, broadly true, in the sense that it's the same data.

JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay.

MR. SCHMIDT: And I'm about to exhaust every technical piece of knowledge I have in answering this question, but as I understand it, what we can't figure out is what manipulation -- Mr. Carroll spent a lot of time with Dr. Singer yesterday going through a very technical analysis of what he did in this specific inquiry.

As I understand it, Mr. Orszag is now responding to that, and we cannot do the same thing because, while we know the same general data, what we don't know is how Mr. Orszag manipulated that data to be able to do

Page 1012 1 the same kind of analysis that Mr. Carroll 2 did. 3 And that's really the nature of our concern, the history here --4 5 JUDGE SIPPEL: Go ahead. 6 MR. SCHMIDT: Sorry. I apologize. 7 The history here is that this data originally 8 flows from the motion to compel that Your 9 Honor granted I believe a month or so ago, so it was not available at the time of Dr. 10 11 Singer's report. 12 It was included in his expert 13 disclosure on April 13th. To be clear, there 14 were new analyses that both sides put in their 15 April 13th disclosure. That happened with 16 folks on their side. Dr. Singer did that in 17 this area. 18 The concern we have is --19 JUDGE SIPPEL: In this area, 20 you're patting the table. You mean, in his

MR. SCHMIDT: Yes, sir.

21

22

testimony?

JUDGE SIPPEL: His written
testimony? Thank you.

2 testimony? Thank you.

MR. SCHMIDT: Yes, sir. On the 19th, my colleagues on the other side of the table came to us and said, we need the underlying data. We produced it pretty promptly.

As Mr. Carroll said, they came back to us on the Friday and said, asked for the data again. We said the data we have is the data we gave to you the prior Tuesday.

And the concern we have is simply, at 9:30 at night, getting this data, looking at it for two hours, at 11:30 at night realizing that we couldn't figure out what he did in that look, and then I guess, as I understand it, with further review overnight by Dr. Singer's assistant, realizing we're not even sure we have all the data.

So that's the concern we have, is it does seem to be there has to be an end to rebuttals and surrebuttals and new analyses,

1 and third analyses --

2 JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes, there will be.

3 That's my job.

12

But let me suggest this, then.

5 Obviously, I mean, this is the genius of

6 discovery in depositions. You obviously need

7 something to ferret this out, and it's either

8 a question of -- well, we could put the

9 | witness on. What's his name again, Mr. --

MR. CARROLL: Orszag.

11 JUDGE SIPPEL: Pardon?

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Orszag.

JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes, Mr. Orszag.

14 And I've seen him before. I'm sorry, I'm just

15 | -- names are slipping from me.

You get Mr. Orszag on, and you go

17 through as much as you can and leave this area

18 out. And then you'll get this transcript, and

19 then -- well, you wouldn't -- my idea is that

20 you wouldn't cross examine him.

21 If it could be done today or

22 tomorrow, then, maybe by -- what is tomorrow?

Thursday? By Friday you could be prepared for cross examination.

Or if it takes a deposition and preparation over the weekend, if Mr. Carroll doesn't object to this --

MR. CARROLL: No objection.

JUDGE SIPPEL: We come back on Monday with him, so that you would be, you know, fully prepared.

What I don't -- want to avoid, is

I want to avoid depositions in the middle of
the hearing, I mean, using the witness chair
here for depositions.

So, I'll accommodate -- I'll personally accommodate, but it's got to be careful to be dovetailed with Mr. Carroll, because -- well, for obvious reasons.

MR. SCHMIDT: Well, let me say,
Your Honor, first of all, I appreciate very
much -- we appreciate very much, Your Honor,
your understanding of that, and giving us the
opportunity for a fair exploration of Mr.

1 Orszag's new opinions.

And I appreciate Mr. Carroll agreeing to work with us, as I just understood him to say.

What may make sense in terms of disruption of the witness is -- I'm loathe to put us terribly out of schedule for this analysis, when I'm not sure how much it will feature in Mr. Orszag's testimony. It may make sense to put him on on everything else and return to this issue --

MR. CARROLL: I'm fine with that.

MR. SCHMIDT: -- or make an assessment of where we stand on this issue, because frankly, and it's why I appreciate Your Honor's flexibility, we're still, not, to be honest, really sure what he's going to say on this, and it may be that this is a small issue. It may be that it's a big issue. And we'll know the answer to that after he testifies.

And if there's kind of re-opener

Page 1017 1 on this one limited issue, that may be 2 necessary, it may not be necessary. I think 3 that would address our concerns. 4 MR. CARROLL: And Your Honor, I'm 5 fine -- I'm more than happy to accommodate 6 that, because I really think the bottom line 7 should be, we just sort of get to the bottom 8 of it with the exchange of information. 9 So if they'd like to reserve the 10 right to recall Mr. Orszag on this issue, 11 there's no objection from my side. 12 If they'd like the right to do 13 some examination of Mr. Orszag over the weekend on this issue, I won't object to that 14 15 either. 16 JUDGE SIPPEL: You're certainly 17 being accommodating. 18 MR. SCHMIDT: I think that answers 19 our question, Your Honor. I appreciate it. 20 JUDGE SIPPEL: May I just make one

Yes.

MR. SCHMIDT:

21

22

suggestion?

JUDGE SIPPEL: Perhaps between now and lunch time, you know, if your team can accommodate this, Mr. Carroll, maybe you could put together a short form Rule 26 proffer of what he's going to do with that information.

MR. CARROLL: We actually sent that over last night. We sent them a short supplemental statement of the opinions he'd be offering in the area.

But to be fair, I think Mr.

Schmidt would say, but I haven't had a chance to explore that and get behind that, and therefore, that's why I'm not resisting this.

And I'm happy to work with him.

If I'd known there was a data issue still

remaining last night, I would have made

resources available overnight.

I have resources sitting back in a room right now that if you get me a name on your side, I'll see if I can help them solve any issue they're having accessing the data.

And as I hope everyone will

202-234-4433

Page 1019 1 appreciate, I'm trying to be as accommodating 2 as possible on this issue. And I'll make Mr. 3 Orszag available again, and I'll also make sure that they get any facilitation with the 4 5 data they need here. JUDGE SIPPEL: That is wonderful. 6 7 I appreciate this, and I'm sure the other side 8 does appreciate this very much, too. 9 MR. CARROLL: See, a good night's 10 rest, and I've woken up in a good mood here, 11 and not withstanding the baseball game --12 JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, no, I'm telling you -- I mean, it just goes to show, 13 14 you see, if Mr. Schmidt had gone to the baseball game last night, he wouldn't have 15 16 known anything about that. 17 (Laughter.) 18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That would be a better world for everyone, Your Honor. 19 20 JUDGE SIPPEL: There's a reason 21 for all those places to go.

(Laughter.)

22

1 By the way, I couldn't help but think of Tennis Channel when I was sitting 2 over there with my daughter, you know, looking 3 around the stadium. And I mean, boy, if you 4 all are looking for that demographic that you 5 plus income, it 6 with want, was sitting there for the taking. 7 8 (Laughter.) 9 Now, that's not true in the right field of the Yankee Stadium. 10 11 (Laughter.) 12 MR. CARROLL: No, those would be the Versus fans out there. 13 14 (Laughter.) 15 JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes, Versus was a 16 little too light for them, maybe. 17 Okay. We're on base now. 18 sorry, Dr. Singer, I apologize. I meant to 19 say good morning to you, sir. 20 THE WITNESS: Good morning. How 21 is everything? 22 JUDGE SIPPEL: We just got -- oh,

	Page 1021
1	fine with me. Are you all right? You're
2	fine. I shouldn't ask it that way.
3	Okay. You still understand,
4	you're still under oath.
5	Are you set to go forward with
6	this cross?
7	MR. CARROLL: We're all set to go
8	forward.
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. Let's do it,
10	please.
11	MR. CARROLL: Thank you, Your
12	Honor.
13	WHEREUPON,
14	HAL SINGER
15	HAVING BEEN PREVIOUSLY SWORN, WAS RECALLED AND
16	TESTIFIED AS FOLLOWS:
17	CROSS EXAMINATION (CONTINUED)
18	BY MR. CARROLL:
19	Q I thought that I'd pick up where
20	we left up yesterday, and let me review as a
21	refresher here, Dr. Singer.
22	We had spoken vesterday at the end

of the day about how you went about averaging the market share information as part of your analysis. Do you remember that subject?

A Yes.

Q Okay. And I think, after some back and forth, you explained that what you did was you weighted the average and the weighting factor that you used, you used the headend data as effectively your weighting.

Is that correct?

A That's effectively what happened.

Of course, I didn't set about to weight headends, but that's effectively what happened as a result of my merge.

MR. CARROLL: Okay. And Your

Honor, I thought it would be just terrific if
we started with another addition to the
glossary this morning. If I may --

JUDGE SIPPEL: Growing.

MR. CARROLL: May I approach, Your

21 Honor?

JUDGE SIPPEL: Please do.